

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 2 and 4 have been amended in order to more particularly point out, and distinctly claim the subject matter to which the applicants regard as their invention.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,757,729 to Devarakonda.

The present invention is a server (10) able to communicate with different appliances using different SDPs (Service Discovery Protocol) using a common database (11). The common database (11) stores service information for service attributes provided by SDP handlers (12, 13, and 14). The service information stored in the common database (11) is written in a common format that can be understood by all SDP handlers (12, 13, and 14).

Devarakonda describes a virtual environment manager for network computers. Service access is provided by a Service Directory Manager that maintains a table of services referred to as a Service Directory Table. There may be any number of Service Directory Managers while there may be a single instance of the Service Directory Table. The Service Directory Table contains information about the system and application services offered by the Service Providers on the network.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertions Devarakonda does not disclose "a conversion means for mutually converting service information between a format used in said one service discovery protocol handled in this handler means and said common format" as recited in claim 1.

Further, none of the cited references teach or suggest the important fundamental feature of the present invention, "a server allowing an apparatus using one service discovery protocol (first service discovery protocol) to discover a service information using the other service discovery protocol (second service discovery protocol)" as recited in amended claim 1.

Still further, claim 1 has been amended by adding the limitation that "wherein said conversion means does not convert the service information from said first or second service discovery protocol when the service information is in the same format as that contained in said common database and does convert the service information from said first or second service discovery protocol when the service information is not in the same format as that contained in said common database". This limitation is also not taught by the prior art of record.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,757,729 to Devarakonda is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-4, as amended, are believed to be patentable and in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



George N. Stevens
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 36,938

GNS/nrp
Atty. Docket No. 011735
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE